




Will v. Michigan Department of State Police, 109 S.Ct. 2304, 2312 (1989). In essence, then, the plaintiff's claims are against Giles County, the municipal entity that operates the Jail. See Kentucky v. Graham, 105 S.Ct. 3099, 3105 (1985).

A claim of governmental liability requires a showing that the misconduct complained of came about pursuant to a policy, statement, regulation, decision or custom promulgated by Giles County or its agent, the Giles County Sheriff's Department. Monell v. New York City Department of Social Services, 98 S.Ct. 2018 (1978). In short, for Giles County to be liable under § 1983, there must be a direct causal link between an official policy or custom and the alleged constitutional violation. City of Canton v. Harris, 109 S.Ct. 1197 (1989).

The plaintiff has offered nothing to suggest that his rights were violated pursuant to a policy or regulation of Giles County that required poor living conditions at the Giles County Jail. Consequently, the plaintiff has failed to state a claim against the defendants acting in their official capacities.

In the absence of an actionable claim, the Court is obliged to dismiss the complaint *sua sponte*. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

An appropriate Order will be entered.

  
Robert L. Echols  
United States District Judge